



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,435	12/15/2003	Janet L. Schorr	06576.105133	3420
25096	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP			LIOU, JONATHAN	
PATENT-SEA				
P.O. BOX 1247			ART UNIT	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			PAPER NUMBER	
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/736,435

Applicant(s)

SCHORR ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan Liou

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/10/2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 filed on 2/10/2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In addition, applicant's statement regarding a non-public use filed on 04/06/2006 as been acknowledged and considered by examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16-17, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter et al. (Microsoft Office 2000, 1999.).

Regarding claim 1, Courter et al. teach a computer-implemented method (Microsoft Outlook) for generating a child timeline (See Figure 20.13, page 495), comprising the steps of:

Selecting a portion of a parent timeline having a first data item (Fig. 20.12, page 494, shows a portion of apparent timeline having a first data item.)

Generating the child timeline based on the portion of the parent timeline, the child timeline having a second data item corresponding to the first data item (the child timeline would be created while the portion of the parent timeline has been selected. For example, if the time 10:00~12:00 is selected, the child window as shown in Fig. 20.13 would show up with the corresponding range of time as shown in the parent.)

Dynamically-linking the child timeline to the parent timeline such that when the first data item of the parent timeline is modified, the second data item of the child timeline is automatically modified to conform to the first data item, and when the second data item of the child timeline is modified, the first data item of the parent timeline is automatically modified to conform to the second data item (The subject is entered in the selected portion, which would be the parent timeline, as shown in Fig. 20.12, Page 494; and, the subject in the child window as shown in Fig. 20.13 would automatically changed to conform to the subject entered in Fig. 20.12. and vice versa. In addition, Courter et al. does not specifically show child timeline is linear; however, it would have been obvious to one who has ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make timeline linear because Courter et al. also teach to make scheduling task on the linear timeline (Fig. 20.8, page 489.) In addition, Courter et al. teach user could design custom view to meet particular needs (page 489.)

Regarding claim 2, the data item could be added into the location area or the data entries area as shown in Fig. 20.13. By adding the data items into those areas, the data item would not be shown in the parent timeline as shown in Fig. 20.12.

Regarding claim 3, If the first time is as the whole portion of child timeline, which selected from parent timeline, Courter et al.'s entry in Fig. 20.12 would shown in Fig. 20.13. For example, if the time selected is 10:00 as the first time in Fig. 20.12; then, the child would show starting time as 10:00 at the child timeline in Fig. 20.13.

Regarding claim 4, Courter et al. shows show time could be Busy or Free, which could be milestone as claimed and data entry would be interval data item (See page 494-495.)

Regarding claim 8, Courter et al. shows the starting time and ending time to represent the time frame from the parent (See 494-495.) Courter et al. does not show the timeline being linear. However it would have been obvious as the same rationale as provided in the claim rejection 1 above.

Regarding claim 9, Courter et al. teach associating the child timeline with the portion of the parent timeline (the child timeline is generated while the portion of the parent timeline is selected by the user. See page 494-495.) Modifying the subject title in children timeline in Fig. 20.13 would reflect to the parent timeline in Fig. 20.12 and vice versa.

Regarding claim 10, modifying on the portion of location and data entries in Fig. 20.13 would not affect on parent timeline, but if the changes made on the subject data; then, the parent timeline would be modified corresponding to the changes of the subject

Art Unit: 2663

data in the child timeline (See page 494-495.) The same rationale and basis as applied to claim 1 are applied to the remainder of claim 10.

Regarding claim 11, by adding more content and symbol to represent a milestone data or a time interval data to the portion of the first timeline; then, those modification would appear in the subject data entries of child timeline (See page 494-495.)

Regarding claim 12, the data item could be modified as on the time frame location (See Fig. 494.) For example, the time frame could be adjust from 9:00~10:00 to 9:30~10:00 or simply create inside portion, such as 9:15~9:30 which in the portion of 9:00~10:00.

Regarding claims 13-14, 16, 17, 20-22, these claims are system and computer instructions claims. The functions recited in these claims are similar to claims 1-4, 8-9, 10-12; thus, the same rationale are applied. Courter et al. do not specifically teach system or instructions to perform the method. However, Microsoft outlook would require the system and instructions to perform those functions in order to make the method works. Therefore, following the same rationale and basis as applied to claims 1-4, 8-9, 10-12 are applied to the remainder of claims 13-14, 16, 17, 20, 21.

5. Claims 5-7, 15, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter et al. (Microsoft Office 2000, 1999.), in view of Visio 2000 Standard Edition User Guide.

Regarding claims 5-7, Courter et al. teach the method of claim 1. Courter does not specifically teach virtually interrelationship and placing an icon on the portion of

Art Unit: 2663

timeline to result virtually and connected data on the child timeline. However, Visio 2000 User Guide teach displaying through a graphical user interface an interrelationship between the parent timeline and child timeline in response to generating the child timeline and placing an icon by visually connecting the child timeline to the portion of the parent timeline (In page 10, it shows icon on parent timeline and shows connected the icon to expand child timeline) Since Outlook provides the timeline (see page 489) and Visio standard shows the interrelationship (page 10), it would have been obvious to one who has ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place an icon and have interrelationship between parent and child timeline because it would have advantage easier to read the relationship between parent and child. In addition, Outlook also shows the portion of time frame in parent on the child timeline as well (See page 494-495, Microsoft office 2000)

Regarding claims 15, 18-19, the same rationale as applied to claims 5-7, 13 and 17 are applied.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Liou whose telephone number is 571-272-8136. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM Mon-Fri.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Liou

4/26/2006

  
RICKY Q. NGO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER